DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 753 SP 007 738

AUTHOR Fitzgerald, Sheila M.
TITLE A Career Needs Comparison of Elementary School Teachers and Undergraduate Students in an Elementary School Teacher Preparation Program.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Education Majors; *Job Satisfaction; *Needs; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota Importance Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

To determine if the career needs of undergraduate students entering a teacher preparation program would be similar to the needs expressed by experienced teachers on the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIP), the responses of 100 undergraduate elementary education students at Michigan State University were compared to those of 178 career teachers engaged in graduate studies at the University of Minnesota. Twenty-five scales adapted from the MIP were represented by 100 items which the respondents ranked on a one-to-five point Likert scale. Analysis of the responses showed that a) the undergraduate group had significantly lower career needs in the areas of advancement, compensation, recognition, supervision, and work accomplishment; b) the mean differences between the two groups were not significantly different for 15 of the 25 scales; c) both groups indicated that creativity, cooperation, dedication of teachers, and overall job satisfaction were their most important career needs; and d) both groups agreed that work accomplishment (amount of paper work), structure, recognition, and advancement were low priority career needs. Findings of this study suggest that a) more flexible staffing schedules would increase job satisfaction for teachers; b) schools of education must present a more realistic view of the teaching profession and make stronger efforts to attract males to the profession; and c) studies need to be conducted that relate satisfaction of teachers to their measured effectiveness. (The report includes 10 statistical tables and a copy of the survey questionnaire.) (HMD)

ED 087753

AUG 9 1973

A CAREER NEEDS COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

629

Sheila M. Fitzgerald
Assistant Professor
Department of Elementary and Special Education
1973

SP 007 738

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. The Problem

Background of the Study 1

Pilot Study 2

Plan of the Study 3

Research Instruments Used 3

Hypotheses to be Tested 7

Statistical Programs Used 7

II. Analysis of the Data

A Description of the Graduate Teacher Group 8

A Description of the Undergraduate Student Group 12

Analyses by Hypotheses 15

Hypothesis 1: Future Career Plans 15
Hypothesis 2: Career Needs 17

III. Summary and Conclusions

Findings of the Study 21

Implications for Teachers and School Systems 23

Implications for Teacher Education 24

Implications for Further Research 25

Appendix 27

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background of the Study

The literature on education, both popular and professional, presents an increasing number of articles which attack the quality of American public education. Suggestions for ways to improve the learning opportunities for children include: extension of the curriculum into different subject areas, more flexible arrangement of school hours and programs, more individual attention to students, more media and materials. Increased demands are placed on teachers in each of these solutions. Little attention is given to the rising pressures on the primary facilitator of the learning process, the teacher. The sincere efforts of the public, school officials and the efforts of the teachers themselves to raise the educational opportunities of children may be negated if the working conditions for teachers are not an important consideration in the planning for changes in education.

Since the early studies of worker morale in the 1920's, attention has been given to the effect of morale on productivity. In more recent years there is recognition that society collectively wants to satisfy the worker's personal needs apart from the effect his morale may have on his productivity when satisfaction does not interfere with the accomplishment of the task.

In the spring of 1972, a study surveyed a group of 178 experienced elementary school teachers about their attitudes toward their teaching careers.[1] Of the original 208 Master of Arts degree students in Elementary Education at

[1] Sheila Fitzgerald, Career Attitudes of Elementary School Teachers, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1972.

the University of Minnesota, 86 percent returned mailed questionnaires which were sufficiently complete to be included in the analysis. In addition to a request for demographic data, the questionnaire included a 100 item form (25 scales) of The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and a matching form of The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ). The MSQ was employed to provide data about the teachers' degrees of satisfaction with their current or most recent elementary school teaching positions; the MIQ identified the levels of needs the teachers would identify in an ideal elementary school teaching position.

One of the questions which arose at the conclusion of the study was whether career needs of undergraduate students entering a teacher preparation program would be similar to the needs expressed by the experienced teachers on The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire. It was decided to conduct a pilot study with a small group of University of Minnesota undergraduate students and a complete study of all Michigan State University students entering their first quarter of professional preparation.

PILOT STUDY

Thirty students who were accepted into a special program for elementary teacher preparation at the University of Minnesota were requested to complete the applicable demographic data and the MIQ section of the questionnaire which had been mailed to the experienced teachers. These students were completing their first week of field experience in an elementary school early in September 1972 prior to the opening of university classes. The session was conducted by the experimenter and full participation was achieved. However, some students found it difficult to select and complete the appropriate sections,

and it was decided that the questionnaire should be adapted to include only the appropriate parts before conducting the body of the study.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

All students entering ED 101, Exploring Elementary Teaching, during the fall quarter of 1972 at Michigan State University were included in the undergraduate population of the study. These one hundred students were asked to complete the modified questionnaire during the second general session in the first week of classes. The experimenter explained the questionnaire and encouraged students to complete the form thoroughly and accurately.

The undergraduate responses to the questionnaire were compared to the results obtained from the experienced teacher group in the 1972 study. Special attention was directed to the comparison of five and ten year future career plans and to the comparison of responses on the twenty-five scales of The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED

In 1964, the Work Adjustment Project at the University of Minnesota published its first formulation of a theory of work adjustment.[2] Subsequent research established the validity and utility of the theory in developing tools for predicting and measuring an individual's adjustment to work. The MSQ and MIQ, two of the instruments developed by the project, have been used in standard testing forms, but in 1971, Dawis and Weitzel introduced the "Triple Audit", a plan for tailor fitting these instruments to a particular company or organization under study.

[2]Dawis, Lofquist and Weiss, "Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: A Theory of Work Adjustment", Bulletin xxiii, University of Minnesota, 1968.

Of the 58 possible scales for study in the "Triple Audit" form, twenty-five were selected as being most suitable for a study of teachers. Slight word changes were made to make the language appropriate to a school setting rather than to industry. The scales are listed on the following page followed by a representative test item. Each of the twenty-five scales has four related items in the questionnaire, making a total of 100 items. The respondent rated the importance of each item on a one to five point Likert scale.

SCALE	SAMPLE ITEM
	In my ideal teaching position, how important is it that...
Ability Utilization	1. I would have the chance to do work that is well suited to my abilities
Dedication of Teachers	2. Teachers would be dedicated to the education of children
Advancement	3. There would be opportunities for advancement in this work
Career Development	4. My work would lead to the development of my career
Closure	5. I would have the chance to complete a task I started
Compensation (Amount)	6. The pay would be fair for the work I do
Cooperation	7. There would be cooperation between teachers and other staff members
Co-workers (Friendliness)	8. There would be a spirit of cooperation among the teachers
Co-workers (Performance)	9. My co-workers would work hard
Creativity	10. There would be time to try out some of my own ideas
Independence	11. There would be the chance to work independently of others
Individual Identity	12. I would not feel lost as an individual in my school system
Organization Control	13. I would be given freedom in the ways and means of doing my work
Recognition	14. I would get full credit for the work I do
Responsibility	15. I would be responsible for planning my work
Security	16. I could feel secure about the job
Social Service	17. I could have the chance to be of service to others
Structure	18. I would have a clear idea of what I am required to do
Supervision (Human Relations)	19. My principal would work well with his teacher

SCALE	SAMPLE ITEM
Supervision (Technical)	20. The principal would have knowledge of curriculum and instruction
Variety	21. There would be variety in my work
Work Accomplishment	22. There would be little paper work I must do
Work Challenge	23. The work would be challenging
Work Involvement	24. I would have increasing interest in my work, the longer I held the job
General Factor	25. I would like my job

The complete questionnaire is included in the appendix.

HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

The following hypotheses, stated in null form, were tested:

1. There are no significant differences between the Graduate Teacher Group and the MSU Undergraduate Student Group in their five and ten year career plans.

2. There are no significant differences between the Graduate Teacher Group and the MSU Undergraduate Student Group in their career needs expressed on the twenty-five scales of The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire.

STATISTICAL PROGRAMS USED

UMST 600 (Descriptive Statistics) and UMST 620 (Chi Squares on Raw Data Frequencies) as reported in the 1972 study were used to tabulate demographic results for the graduate teacher group. UMST 510 (Analysis of Variance, Equal Frequencies) provided means, Hoyt Reliabilities and Standard Errors for scale scores on The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire.

The questionnaire responses of the undergraduate student groups for both the University of Minnesota and Michigan State University were analyzed for descriptive data by the MSU STAT SYSTEM:PF COUNT and CISSR:ACT. Hoyt Reliabilities for scales of The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire were obtained from the MSU OFFICE OF RESEARCH CONSULTATION: FORTAP program. MIQ scale scoring for the Undergraduate Student Group was run on MSU STAT SYSTEM:BASTAT, and multivariate comparisons of the teacher and student groups were obtained through the JEREMY FINN MULTIVARIANCE: FORTRAN PROGRAM FOR UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AND COVARIANCE.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A Description of the Graduate Teacher Group

One hundred seventy-eight (86%) of the teacher population in this study returned questionnaires which were sufficiently complete to use in this study. A comparison of the respondents (178) and non-respondents (25) on academic measures of quarters attended, credits completed and grade point averages showed no significant differences. The high percentage of return and the lack of differences on academic measures made it reasonable to interpret the returned questionnaires as representative of the total population.

Only 61 per cent of the teacher group reported that they are currently employed in elementary school teaching. Their expectations for teaching five and ten years from now drop to 56 per cent and 55 per cent.

One hundred fifty-four of the respondents were women and twenty-three were men indicating that elementary education continues to be an area employing women predominantly. The age range of respondents was from under 25 years to age 59 with 53 per cent coming in the 25 to 34 year age span. One-fourth of the group had taught less than five years, and one-third had taught more than ten years; they had spent an average of 3.9 years in their latest job whether it was in teaching or in some other field. This group had completed an average of twenty-two credits of a Master of Arts Degree program with a major in Elementary Education at the University of Minnesota and had earned an average 3.39 GPA. The fact that this group of teachers sought more education speaks to a degree of commitment to their profession.

In general, the group which forms the population of this study is a select group of teachers, select in academic ability and select in their interest in teaching. As graduate students they are viewed as representative of teachers who pursue advanced study, usually on a part-time basis, while maintaining a full commitment to teaching, to homemaking or to other occupations. Table 2:01 summarized demographic information for the Graduate Teacher Group.

Table 2:01

Variable Frequencies and Percentages for the Graduate Teacher Group

	Number of Respondents	Per Cent
Residence	(N = 177)	
1. Minneapolis-St. Paul Area	127	72
2. Other Minnesota City or Town	11	6
3. USA City outside of Minnesota	23	13
4. USA Town outside of Minnesota	10	6
5. Foreign City or Town	6	3
Sex	(N = 178)	
1. Female	154	87
2. Male	23	13
Age	(N = 177)	
1. Under 25 years	7	4
2. 25 - 29	62	35
3. 30 - 34	32	18
4. 35 - 39	27	15
5. 40 - 44	22	13
6. 45 - 49	13	7
7. 50 - 54	9	5
8. 55 - 59	5	3
9. 60 or over	0	0
Marital Status	(N = 177)	
1. Single	31	18
2. Married	137	77
3. Widowed	4	2
4. Separated or Divorced	5	3
Location of Bachelor of Arts Degree	(N = 177)	
1. University of Minnesota	73	41
2. Other Minnesota Institution	54	31
3. Other USA Institution	48	27
4. Foreign Institution	12	1
Total Number of Years Teaching in Elementary Schools	(N = 175)	
1. Less than 5 years	46	26
2. 5 - 9	73	42
3. 10 - 14	29	17
4. 15 - 19	13	7
5. 20 - 24	9	5
6. 25 - 29	5	3
7. 30 or more years	0	0

Table 2:01 (continued)

Variable Frequencies and Percentages for the Graduate Teacher Group

	Number of Respondents	Per Cent
Current Employment	(N = 174)	
1. Full-time elementary education personnel	106	61
2. Part-time elementary education personnel	13	7
3. Full-time housewife	24	14
4. Full-time graduate student	2	1
5. Full-time employment other than elementary	10	6
6. Part-time employment other than elementary	2	1
7. Other	17	10
Employment Plans for Five Years from Now	(N = 165)	
1. Full-time elementary education personnel	92	56
2. Part-time elementary education personnel	26	16
3. Full-time housewife	11	7
4. Full-time graduate student	3	2
5. Full-time employment other than elementary	8	5
6. Part-time employment other than elementary	4	2
7. Other	21	13
Employment Plans for Ten Years from Now	(N = 165)	
1. Full-time elementary education personnel	91	55
2. Part-time elementary education personnel	29	18
3. Full-time housewfie	6	4
4. Full-time graduate student	1	1
5. Full-time employment other than elementary	11	7
6. Part-time employment other than elementary	8	5
7. Other	19	10
If Married, Number of Children	(N = 142)	
1. 0	45	32
2. 1 - 2	66	46
3. 3 or more	31	22
If Married, Number of Children Living at Home	(N = 121)	
1. 0	34	28
2. 1 - 2	62	51
3. 3 or more	25	21

A DESCRIPTION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GROUP

One hundred students entering a professional elementary and special education teacher preparation program at Michigan State University comprised the student population of this study. This group included all of the students enrolled during the fall quarter of 1972 in ED 101, Exploring Elementary Teaching, the first required professional course in their program.

The students represented a full range of academic standing levels from freshman to post baccalaureate degree students. The upper levels included students who transferred from other colleges, students who changed majors or students who were seeking teaching certification after graduation:

Freshman classification	8
Sophomore classification	30
Junior classification	46
Senior classification	9
Past B. A. classification	7
TOTAL	100

Of the entire student group, 66 per cent indicated that their family home was in Michigan but outside of the Lansing metropolitan area; 71 per cent of the group were women and 29 per cent were men. Nearly all of the students (91 per cent) were under 25 years of age, and 77 per cent of them were single.

The students of the University of Minnesota student group responded to the descriptive data in a similar manner to the Michigan State University student group. Summaries of the data for both groups are given in Tables 2:02 and 2:03. The only noticeable difference is the number of Minnesota students whose family homes were in the Minneapolis metropolitan area (96 per cent) in contrast to the number of Michigan State University students whose family homes were in the Lansing metropolitan area (28 per cent). In response to the MIQ

Table 2:02

Variable Frequencies and Percentages for
University of Minnesota Undergraduate Students

	Number of Respondents	Per Cent
Residence	(N = 28)	
1. Minneapolis-St. Paul Area	27	96
2. Other Minnesota City or Town	1	4
3. USA City outside of Minnesota	0	0
4. USA Town outside of Minnesota	0	0
5. Foreign City or Town	0	0
Sex	(N = 30)	
1. Female	23	77
2. Male	7	23
Age	(N = 30)	
1. Under 25 years	27	90
2. 25 - 29	1	3
3. 30 - 34	2	7
4. 35 - 39	0	0
5. 40 - 44	0	0
6. 45 - 49	0	0
7. 50 - 54	0	0
8. 55 - 59	0	0
9. 60 or over	0	0
Marital Status	(N = 30)	
1. Single	24	80
2. Married	4	13
3. Widowed	0	0
4. Separated or Divorced	2	7
Employment Plans for Five Years from Now		
1. Full-time elementary education personnel		
2. Part-time elementary education personnel		
3. Full-time housewife		
4. Full-time graduate student	No Information Available	
5. Full-time employment other than elementary		
6. Part-time employment other than elementary		
7. Other		
Employment Plans for Ten Years from now		
1. Full-time elementary education personnel		
2. Part-time elementary education personnel		
3. Full-time housewife		
4. Full-time graduate student	No Information Available	
5. Full-time employment other than elementary		
6. Part-time employment other than elementary		
7. Other		

Table 2:03

Variable Frequencies and Percentages for
Michigan State University Undergraduate Students

	Number of Respondents	Per Cent
Residence	(N = 100)	
1. Lansing Metropolitan Area	28	28
2. Other Michigan City or Town	66	66
3. USA City outside of Michigan	4	4
4. USA Town outside of Michigan	2	2
5. Foreign City or Town	0	0
Sex	(N = 100)	
1. Female	71	71
2. Male	29	29
Age	(N = 99)	
1. Under 25 years	90	9[illegible]
2. 25 - 29	6	6
3. 30 - 34	2	2
4. 35 - 39	0	0
5. 40 - 44	0	0
6. 45 - 49	0	0
7. 50 - 54	1	1
8. 55 - 59	0	0
9. 60 or over	0	0
Marital Status	(N = 100)	
1. Single	77	77
2. Married	20	20
3. Widowed	0	0
4. Separated or Divorced	3	3
Employment Plans for Five Years from Now	(N = 100)	
1. Full-time elementary education personnel	72	72
2. Part-time elementary education personnel	12	12
3. Full-time housewife	1	1
4. Full-time graduate student	1	1
5. Full-time employment other than elementary	3	3
6. Part-time employment other than elementary	1	1
7. Other	10	10
Employment Plans for Ten Years from Now	(N = 100)	
1. Full-time elementary education personnel	43	43
2. Part-time elementary education personnel	23	23
3. Full-time housewfie	2	2
4. Full-time graduate student	0	0
5. Full-time employment other than elementary	14	14
6. Part-time employment other than elementary	6	6
7. Other	12	12

scales, the mean scores of the two student groups showed mean differences of .3 or less on twenty of the scales with the maximum difference of .6. It is reasonable to assume that the responses of the Michigan State University students are representative of students in an elementary teacher education program at a major university.

ANALYSIS BY HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences between the Graduate Teacher Group and the MSU Undergraduate Student Group in their five year and ten year future career plans.

Of the Graduate Teacher Group, 56 per cent intend to be teaching full time in an elementary school five years from now, and 16 per cent intend to be teaching part time in an elementary school. Seventy-two per cent of the students intend to be teaching full time in five years, and 12 per cent intend to teach part time. The differences between the teacher group and the student group were significant at a 5 per cent level on the chi-square test indicating that more of the student group plan to be teaching five years from now.

Fifty-five per cent and 18 per cent of the Graduate Teacher Group intend to be teaching full time and part time in an elementary school ten years from now. The comparable percentages for the Student Group were 43 per cent and 23 per cent. These differences were not significantly different on the chi-square test at the 5 per cent level.

Hypothesis 1 was accepted for five year future career plans for the two groups but rejected for ten year future career plans. Table 2:04 gives data and p-values for the chi-square tests.

Table 2:04

Chi Square Results on Five and Ten Year Future Plans
for Graduate Teacher Group and Michigan State University Undergraduates

Five Year Future Plans*	Grads. (N=165)	MSU Undergrads. (N=100)	X^2	P Value
Full-time elementary education personnel	92	72	7.34	.02>P<.05
Part-time elementary education personnel	26	12		
Full-time housewife	11	1		
Full-time graduate student	3	1		
Full-time employment other than elementary	8	3		
Part-time employment other than elementary	4	1		
Other	21	10		
Total				

Ten Year Future Plans*				
Full-time elementary education personnel	91	43	3.95	.10>P<.20
Part-time elementary education personnel	29	23		
Full-time housewife	6	2		
Full-time graduate student	1	0		
Full-time employment other than elementary	11	14		
Part-time employment other than elementary	8	6		
Other	19	12		
Total				

* Grouping of data was required to meet all requirements on the chi-square test

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences between the Graduate Teacher Group and the MSU Undergraduate Student Group in their career needs expressed on the 25 scales of The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire.

The minimum possible score on each scale was 4.0 and the maximum was 20.0 giving an average need score of 12.0. The range of mean responses on the 25 scales for the Graduate Teacher Group was 12.2 to 17.0. The range for the Undergraduate Group was 9.9 to 17.3. Table 2:05 lists the rank order of needs as indicated by the two groups. A summary of scale means and standard deviations for each group is given in Table 2:06. A complete report of MIQ results is included in the appendix.

The multivariate test of equality indicated an overall difference on the MIQ scale scores with a less than 0.00 probability of happening by chance. The unvariate test indicated ten scales in which significant differences between the two groups were noted with less than .07 probability of occurring by chance: Dedication of Teachers, Advancement, Compensation, Independence, Recognition, Supervision (Human Relations), Supervision (Technical), Work Accomplishment, Work Involvement, and General Factor. Students indicated a greater need than the Graduate Teacher Group in Dedication of Teachers, Independence, Work Involvement, and General Factor, but a significantly lower need than the Graduate Teacher Group in Advancement, Compensation, Recognition, Supervision (Human Relations), Supervision (Technical), and Work Accomplishment. The Step Down F Test reported the General Factor with $F = 3.76$ and a P-Value less than .05. Table 2:07 gives results of the Analysis of Variance Tests. Hypothesis 2 was rejected for ten of the twenty-five scales of career needs on The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire.

Table 2:05

Ranking of Mean Scale Scores

Graduate Teacher Group and Michigan State University Undergraduate Student Group

Graduate Teacher Group N = 178		MSU Undergraduate Student Group N = 100	
Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean
General Factor	17.0	General Factor	17.6
Creativity	16.7	Dedication of Teachers	17.3
Cooperation	16.7	Cooperation	16.9
Dedication of Teachers	16.7	Creativity	16.9
Ability Utilization	16.6	Social Service	16.6
Supervision (Technical)	16.5	Ability Utilization	16.4
Work Challenge	16.2	Co-Workers (Friendliness)	15.8
Co-Workers (Friendliness)	16.0	Organization Control	15.8
Social Service	16.0	Work Challenge	15.8
Co-Workers (Performance)	15.8	Co-Workers (Performance)	15.5
Supervision (Human Relations)	15.8	Supervision (Technical)	15.4
Organization Control	15.7	Responsibility	15.2
Responsibility	15.3	Supervision (Human Relations)	15.1
Variety	15.0	Variety	15.0
Closure	14.9	Individual Identity	14.8
Compensation (Amount)	14.4	Closure	14.6
Individual Identity	14.4	Work Involvement	14.6
Security	14.3	Independence	14.4
Career Development	13.8	Security	14.0
Work Involvement	13.8	Career Development	13.2
Independence	13.7	Compensation	13.1
Advancement	13.4	Advancement	12.2
Recognition	12.6	Structure	11.6
Work Accomplishment	12.4	Recognition	11.6
Structure	12.2	Work Accomplishment	9.9

Table 2:06
Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Three Groups

Scale	Graduate Teacher Group N = 178		University of Minnesota Under-Grads. N = 30		Michigan State University Undergrads N = 100	
	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	$\bar{X}$	s.d.
Ability Utilization	16.6	2.56	16.5	2.49	16.4	2.42
Dedication of Teachers	16.7	2.28	17.0	1.96	17.3	2.21
Advancement	13.4	3.27	11.7	3.16	12.2	3.50
Career Development	13.8	2.79	12.9	2.76	13.2	2.96
Closure	14.9	2.99	14.3	3.08	14.6	3.12
Compensation (Amount)	14.4	2.80	12.9	3.49	13.1	3.17
Cooperation	16.7	2.58	16.8	2.36	16.9	2.58
Co-Workers (Friendliness)	16.0	2.82	15.9	2.55	15.8	2.97
Co-Workers (Performance)	15.8	2.93	15.3	2.35	15.5	3.05
Creativity	16.7	2.53	16.7	2.32	16.9	2.57
Independence	13.7	3.15	14.3	3.24	14.4	2.84
Individual Identity	15.4	2.81	15.1	2,59	14.8	2.98
Organization Control	15.7	2.55	15.7	2.89	15.8	2.67
Recognition	12.6	3.15	11.5	2.87	11.6	3.30
Responsibility	15.3	2.54	15.4	2.16	15.2	2.35
Security	14.3	2.98	13.7	2.68	14.0	3.55
Social Service	16.0	3.07	16.0	3.16	16.6	2.97
Structure	12.2	2.65	11.5	2.34	11.6	2.70
Supervision (Human Relations)	15.8	2.79	15.4	2.58	15.1	2.69
Supervision (Technical)	16.5	2.55	15.4	2.33	15.4	2.61
Variety	15.0	2.80	15.5	2.39	15.0	2.67
Work Accomplishment	12.4	2.62	10.2	2.02	9.9	2.69
Work Challenge	16.2	2.70	16.3	2.80	15.8	2.80
Work Involvement	13.8	3.14	14.3	3.02	14.6	2.66
General Factor	17.0	2.41	18.0	1.63	17.6	1.96

Table 2:07

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance for MIQ Scale Means
Graduate Teacher Group Versus MSU Undergraduate Student Group

Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors
F-ratio = 6.78
D.F. = 25 and 252.00
P < 0.00

Univariate Test

Scale	Univariate F	P Less Than	Significant Factors
Ability Utilization	.59	.44	
Dedication of Teachers	5.24	.02	*
Advancement	8.35	.00	*
Career Development	2.26	.13	
Closure	.62	.43	
Compensation (Amount)	11.83	.00	*
Cooperation	.33	.57	
Co-workers (Friendliness)	.33	.57	
Co-workers (Performance)	.54	.46	
Creativity	.02	.90	
Independence	3.27	.07	*
Individual Identity	.70	.40	
Organization Control	.03	.86	
Recognition	5.69	.02	*
Responsibility	.05	.83	
Security	.64	.42	
Social Service	2.15	.14	
Structure	2.96	.09	
Supervision (Human Relations)	4.65	.03	*
Supervision (Technical)	11.49	.00	*
Variety	.00	.95	
Work Accomplishment	60.80	.00	*
Work Challenge	1.85	.18	
Work Involvement	4.59	.03	*
General Factor	4.01	.05	*

Degrees of Freedom = 1
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 276

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Findings of the Study

Only 61 per cent of the Graduate Teacher Group were teaching full time at the time the questionnaire was mailed in February 1972. Fifty-five per cent indicated that they intend to be teaching full time five years from now; 16 per cent intend to be teaching part time in an elementary school. The percentages for the Undergraduate Student Group were significantly different, 72 per cent intend to be teaching full time and 12 per cent intend to be teaching part time. A very high percentage of the Undergraduate Student Group might be expected to be using their professional training in the initial years following their graduation. It is important to note, however, that less than three-fourths indicate that they will be using their training in full time employment five years from the time they answered the questionnaire.

The percentage of students who plan full time employment in elementary school teaching ten years in the future drops to 43 per cent; 23 per cent hope to have part time teaching employment. These figures did not differ significantly from the Graduate Teacher Group.

At best, less than half of the students expect an uninterrupted teaching career. It seems reasonable to assume that some of the students might plan to return to teaching when anticipated family obligations lessen. These results seem to support Donald E. Super's career delineations for women teachers: the "conventional career pattern," choosing teaching as a stop gap employment before marriage and then becoming full time homemakers, or

the "interrupted career pattern", former teachers returning to teaching after years at home raising a family.[1]

The two groups both ranked four scales of The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire as their highest need areas in teaching: General Factor, (over all satisfaction), Creativity (time to try my own ideas), Cooperation (compatibility between teachers and staff) and Dedication of Teachers (concern for the education of children). There was agreement between the two groups on the four areas of least priority in needs: Work Accomplishment, (little paper work), Structure (having a clear idea of what is expected), Recognition (getting full credit for work done) and Advancement (opportunities for advancement in work).

The mean differences between the two groups were not significantly different for fifteen of the twenty five scales tested: Ability Utilization, Career Development, Closure, Cooperation, Co-Workers (friendliness), Co-Workers (performance), Creativity, Individual Identity, Organization Control, Responsibility, Security, Social Service, Structure, Variety and Work Challenge. On four of the scales, the Undergraduate Group showed a significantly higher need: Dedication of Teachers, Independence, Work Involvement and General Factor. For six of the scales the Undergraduate Group indicated a significantly lower need: Advancement, Compensation, Recognition, Supervision (Human relations), Supervision (Technical), and Work Accomplishment. Some of the differences in needs may be explained by a limited understanding of the career they are entering which undergraduate students could be expected to have. The higher need for Independence as well as less desire for Supervision might be explained by a natural desire of young people for self-direction which family and school obligations have limited up to this point. Certainly a beginning

[1] Donald E. Super, et.al. Vocational Development: A Framework for Research. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957, p. 77

teacher's compensation looks adequate to a student who anticipates a professional salary after years of expensive schooling and limited income. Increasing Compensation, Advancement and Recognition are all long range career goals which might not be of concern to beginning teachers. Work Accomplishment (little paper work) was rated as of little importance by both groups, but beginning teachers had significantly less concern that this aspect of teaching would be a factor in their job satisfaction.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS

1. There are 1.7 women teachers in the United States according to the Occupational Outlook Handbook.[2] Elementary school teaching continues to employ women predominantly, women who also expect to fill the role of homemaker and mother. There is a desire for part time employment possibilities among many teachers and students preparing for teaching. School systems need to examine the advantages a more flexible employment policy might offer for improving the quality of teaching and increasing the job satisfaction of teachers.
2. Compensation is the major factor in negotiations between school boards and teachers yet the Teachers Group in this study ranked fifteen of the twenty-five scales more important than compensation; the Student Group ranked twenty scales more important. Attention needs to be given to other priorities of work satisfaction in teaching when school board and teacher's organizations discuss terms.
3. Four scales were among the highest areas of need for both groups: General Factor, Creativity, Cooperation and Dedication of Teachers. Administrators and teachers should examine their individual school

---

[2] Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1972-73 Edition, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

settings for these qualities and formulate specific programs for implementing needed improvements.

4. School systems should accept that a specific characteristic of elementary school teaching is the interrupted career pattern. Programs should provide for updating teaching skills when a person reenters teaching. They should provide for integration of new teachers, recognizing the special needs that new teachers have. They should investigate whether employment regulations force teachers to maintain a full time job when the job conflicts with other responsibilities and interests, affecting the quality of instruction teachers are able to offer to children.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

1. There continues to be a low percentage of men entering the field of elementary education. Schools of Education need to examine their efforts to attract more men into teaching.
2. Some of the differences on scale scores between the Teacher Group and the Student Group may be attributable to a lack of knowledge offered to students about the profession. Early and often in their preparation, students need direct contact with children and teachers in a school setting. Students need to know more than how to teach, they need to know their own needs as employees, the characteristics of teaching as a career choice, and the research findings on teaching and teachers. They need to understand themselves as new graduates entering teaching, but they also need to see their possible role in education later in life.

3. The Teacher Group and the Student Group showed a difference in their perspective of the technical aspects of the principal's role. Students showed a significantly lower need for this dimension than the Teacher Group. During their preparation, students should see evidence of good supervision as they observe in schools and should be helped to recognize the principal as an important guide for continuing growth in teaching competence.
4. Students need help in understanding their own career needs. They need help in selecting employment in a school system which will meet their expectations.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. A better description of the teacher's responsibilities in the contemporary elementary school is needed so that realistic expectations can be set and innovations can be selected with dimensions of reality in mind.
2. More career research in teaching is needed: why people enter teaching; why they leave it; why teachers leave general classroom responsibilities and enter special class teaching areas. More research is needed comparing teaching to other career choices, particularly areas which also employ a high percentage of women.
3. Studies need to be conducted which relate the needs of teachers and their levels of satisfaction in the job to their measured effectiveness as teachers, a dimension which is called "satisfactoriness" in the Work Adjustment Project theory.
4. Increased understanding of the student's perception of teaching as a career is needed. We need to find out how his needs change as he

goes through the training program and how his needs are satisfied in his beginning teaching assignment.

5. The scope of this study was limited in numbers of participants and in range of scales tested. The attitudes of similar student and teacher groups should be tested to verify the findings reported in this paper. Other scales than those selected for this study should be investigated.

APPENDIX

Appendix :01

Summary Statistics for Minnesota Importance Questionnaire
Graduate Teacher Group
N = 178

Scale	Mean	SD	Hoyt Reliability Coefficient	Standard Error of Measurement
Ability Utilization	16.6	2.56	.89	.85
Dedication of Teachers	16.7	2.28	.76	1.13
Advancement	13.4	3.27	.93	.88
Career Development	13.8	2.79	.79	1.28
Closure	14.9	2.99	.92	.83
Compensation (Amount)	14.4	2.80	.92	.79
Cooperation	16.7	2.58	.91	.77
Co-workers (Friendliness)	16.0	2.82	.90	.90
Co-workers (Performance)	15.8	2.93	.91	.88
Creativity	16.7	2.53	.90	.80
Independence	13.7	3.15	.85	1.20
Individual Identity	14.4	2.80	.81	1.23
Organization Control	15.7	2.55	.89	.85
Recognition	12.6	3.15	.90	.98
Responsibility	15.3	2.54	.87	.92
Security	14.3	2.98	.92	.85
Social Service	16.0	3.07	.96	.63
Structure	12.2	2.65	.74	1.36
Supervision (Human Relations)	15.8	2.79	.81	1.22
Supervision (Technical)	16.5	2.55	.79	1.17
Variety	15.0	2.80	.87	1.02
Work Accomplishment	12.4	2.62	.65	1.56
Work Challenge	16.2	2.70	.91	.82
Work Involvement	13.8	3.14	.78	1.46
General Factor	17.0	2.41	.79	1.10

Appendix :02

Summary Statistics for Minnesota Importance Questionnaire
Michigan State Undergraduate Students
N = 100

Scale	Mean	SD	Hoyt Reliability Coefficient	Standard Error of Measurement
Ability Utilization	16.4	2.42	.82	1.18
Dedication of Teachers	17.3	2.21	.68	1.09
Advancement	12.2	3.50	.93	.81
Career Development	13.2	2.96	.75	1.27
Closure	14.6	3.12	.90	.84
Compensation (Amount)	13.1	3.17	.90	.89
Cooperation	16.9	2.58	.89	.75
Co-Workers (Friendliness)	15.8	2.97	.86	.96
Co-Workers (Performance)	15.5	3.05	.87	.96
Creativity	16.7	2.57	.81	.96
Independence	14.4	2.84	.78	1.16
Individual Identity	14.8	2.98	.77	1.23
Organization Control	15.8	2.67	.86	.88
Recognition	11.6	3.30	.85	1.12
Responsibility	15.2	2.35	.79	.94
Security	14.0	3.55	.91	.93
Social Service	16.6	2.97	.88	.88
Structure	11.6	2.70	.69	1.30
Supervision (Human Relations)	15.1	2.69	.63	1.42
Supervision (Technical)	15.4	2.61	.73	1.18
Variety	15.0	2.67	.77	1.12
Work Accomplishment	9.9	2.69	.62	1.43
Work Challenge	15.8	2.80	.88	.86
Work Involvement	14.6	2.66	.66	1.34
General Factor	17.6	1.96	.73	1.45

Appendix :03

Summary Statistics for Minnesota Importance Questionnaire
University of Minnesota Undergraduate Students
N = 30

Scale	Mean	SD	Hoyt Reliability Coefficient	Standard Error of Measurement
Ability Utilization	16.5	2.49	.85	1.48
Dedication of Teachers	17.0	1.96	.63	1.03
Advancement	11.7	3.16	.87	1.01
Career Development	12.9	2.76	.65	1.41
Closure	14.3	3.08	.82	1.14
Compensation (Amount)	12.9	3.49	.93	.81
Cooperation	16.8	2.36	.84	.82
Co-Workers (Friendliness)	15.9	2.55	.83	.92
Co-Workers (Performance)	15.3	2.38	.85	.80
Creativity	16.7	2.32	.79	.92
Independence	14.3	3.24	.87	1.02
Individual Identity	15.1	2.59	.71	1.20
Organization Control	15.7	2.89	.86	.93
Recognition	11.5	2.87	.81	1.08
Responsibility	15.4	2.16	.68	1.05
Security	13.7	2.68	.82	.99
Social Service	16.0	3.16	.94	.69
Structure	11.5	2.34	.65	1.20
Supervision (Human Relations)	15.4	2.58	.69	1.25
Supervision (Technical)	15.4	2.33	.66	1.17
Variety	15.5	2.39	.74	1.06
Work Accomplishment	10.2	2.02	.39	1.36
Work Challenge	16.3	2.80	.74	1.25
Work Involvement	14.3	3.02	.69	1.46
General Factor	8.0	1.63	.73	.99

CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1 - 5

6 - 9

10 - 12

13 - 15

16 - 19

20 - 23

24

25 - 26

27 - 28

29 - 30

31 - 36

37 - 39

40 - 45

46 - 48

49 - 54

55 - 57

58 - 63

64 - 66

67 - 72

73 - 75

1 - 5

6 - 9

10 - 14

15 - 18

PRESENT ADDRESS:

	Lansing Metropolitan Area	Other Michigan City or Town	U.S.A. City Outside of Michigan	U.S.A. Town Outside of Michigan	Foreign City or Town
(Circle One)	1	2	3	4	5

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Sex: ___ Female ___ Male

Marital Status:
___ Single ___ Married
___ Widowed ___ Separated or Divorced

Number of children ___

Number of children living at home

Age: ___ Under 25 ___ 25-29
___ 30-34 ___ 35-39
___ 40-44 ___ 45-49
___ 50-54 ___ 55-59
___ 60 or over

Characteristics of Your Present Employment and Your Future Employment Aspirations:

Under **5 YEAR** circle the number corresponding to the group you anticipate being identified with five years from now.
Under **10 YEAR** circle the number corresponding to the group you anticipate being identified with ten years from now.

	5 Year	10 Year
1. Employed full time	1	1
2. Employed part time, 50% or less	2	2
3. Employed part time, more than 50%	3	3
4. Full time housewife, not professionally employed	4	4
5. FULL TIME GRADUATE STUDENT, NOT OTHERWISE EMPLOYED	5	5
6. Not employed	6	6

	5 Year	10 Year
1. Elementary education personnel (classroom and special program teachers, supervisors, administrators, etc.)	1	1
2. Secondary education personnel (classroom teachers, supervisors, administrators, etc.)	2	2
3. Higher education personnel (classroom teachers, supervisors, administrators, etc.)	3	3
4. Governmental agency personnel (state and/or federal department employees, penal institution employees, etc.)	4	4
5. Professional organization personnel (executive secretaries and/or chairmen in MEA, AFT, etc.)	5	5

Use of Professional Time

Under **DESIRED** estimate the percentage of time you would like to devote to each activity.

	Desired
1. Administration (including supervision, staff conferences, etc.)	1_____%
2. Teaching (including advising, group in-service work, etc.)	2_____%
3. Research (including original creations, scholarly writing, etc.)	3_____%
4. Service (including work with persons and/or agencies, consulting, etc.)	4_____%
5. General work (professional activities not included above)	5_____%
	100%

SECTION II: IMPORTANCE

In this section we would like you to rate how important each aspect would be in your **IDEAL** elementary school teaching position — the kind of teaching position you would most like to have.

On this page and the following pages you will find statements about certain aspects of work that many people find important.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide how important that aspect of work is to you in terms of your ideal teaching job — the kind of teaching position you would most like to have.
  - Circle "1" if you feel that it is **NOT IMPORTANT** (that you can easily do without it).
  - Circle "2" if you feel that it is **ONLY SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT** (that, if need be, you can do without it).
  - Circle "3" if you feel that it is **IMPORTANT** (that it is hard to do without it).
  - Circle "4" if you feel that it is **VERY IMPORTANT** (that it is very hard to do without it).
  - Circle "5" if you feel that it is **EXTREMELY IMPORTANT** (that it is impossible to do without it).
- Be sure to keep the aspect in mind when rating how important it is to you on your **ideal** teaching position.
- Do this for all statements. Answer every statement.
- Do not turn back to previous statements.

Be frank. Give a true picture of how important you consider each aspect to be in terms of your ideal teaching position.

In my ideal teaching position, how important is it that . . .	not important	only slightly important	important	very important	extremely important
1. I would have the chance to do work that is well suited to my abilities	1	2	3	4	5
2. Teachers would be dedicated to the education of children	1	2	3	4	5
3. There would be opportunities for advancement in this work	1	2	3	4	5
4. My work would lead to the development of my career	1	2	3	4	5
5. I would have the chance to complete a task I started	1	2	3	4	5
6. The pay would be fair for the work I do	1	2	3	4	5
7. There would be cooperation between teachers and other staff members	1	2	3	4	5
8. There would be a spirit of cooperation among the teachers	1	2	3	4	5
9. My co-workers would work hard	1	2	3	4	5
10. There would be time to try out some of my own ideas	1	2	3	4	5
11. There would be the chance to work independently of others	1	2	3	4	5
12. I would not feel lost as an individual in my school system	1	2	3	4	5
13. I would be given freedom in the ways and means of doing my work	1	2	3	4	5
14. I would get full credit for the work I do	1	2	3	4	5
15. I would be responsible for planning my work	1	2	3	4	5

In my ideal teaching position, how important is it that . . .	not important	only slightly important	important	very important	extremely important
16. I could feel secure about the job	1	2	3	4	5
17. I could have the chance to be of service to others	1	2	3	4	5
18. I would have a clear idea of what I am required to do	1	2	3	4	5
19. My principal would work well with his teachers	1	2	3	4	5
20. The principal would have knowledge of curriculum and instruction	1	2	3	4	5
21. There would be variety in my work	1	2	3	4	5
22. There would be little paper work I must do	1	2	3	4	5
23. The work would be challenging	1	2	3	4	5
24. I would have increasing interest in my work, the longer I held the job	1	2	3	4	5
25. I would like my job	1	2	3	4	5
26. There would be chances to make use of my best abilities	1	2	3	4	5
27. I would be able to do something worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5
28. There would be chances of getting ahead in this work	1	2	3	4	5
29. My work would be part of an expanding career in the school system	1	2	3	4	5
30. I would be able to follow a task through to completion	1	2	3	4	5
31. My pay would compensate for the amount of work I do	1	2	3	4	5
32. There would be a willingness to cooperate among the total faculty	1	2	3	4	5
33. My co-workers would be friendly	1	2	3	4	5
34. My co-workers would be competent teachers	1	2	3	4	5
35. There would be time to do new and original things in teaching	1	2	3	4	5
36. There would be the chance to do my work without much supervision	1	2	3	4	5
37. I would feel important as an individual in my school system	1	2	3	4	5
38. There would be the freedom to do a task my own way	1	2	3	4	5
39. I would get recognition for the work I would do	1	2	3	4	5
40. There would be the chance to make decisions on my own	1	2	3	4	5
41. My job would provide for a secure future	1	2	3	4	5
42. There would be the chance to be of service to people	1	2	3	4	5
43. I would have a definite routine in my job	1	2	3	4	5
44. My principal would back up his faculty with parents	1	2	3	4	5
45. My principal would be competent in making decisions	1	2	3	4	5
46. There would be the chance to do different things from time to time	1	2	3	4	5
47. I would have few meetings that I have to attend	1	2	3	4	5
48. I would be able to do work that challenges my abilities	1	2	3	4	5
49. The job would become a part of me, the longer I held the job	1	2	3	4	5
50. I would like the work I would be doing	1	2	3	4	5
51. There would be the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	1	2	3	4	5
52. I would have the chance to do my best at all times	1	2	3	4	5
53. There would be chances for advancement in the work	1	2	3	4	5
54. There would be a variety of aspects in my work	1	2	3	4	5
55. I would have the chance to complete each task	1	2	3	4	5
56. The salary would be adequate	1	2	3	4	5
57. There would be willingness of teachers and other staff to cooperate	1	2	3	4	5
58. My co-workers would be easy to make friends with	1	2	3	4	5
59. My co-workers would be diligent workers	1	2	3	4	5
60. There would be time to develop new and better ways to teach	1	2	3	4	5
61. There would be the chance to do my work without depending on others	1	2	3	4	5
62. The people with whom I would work would care about me as an individual	1	2	3	4	5
63. There would be the freedom to decide how to do my work	1	2	3	4	5
64. The principal would tell me when I have done a good job in teaching	1	2	3	4	5
65. I would have the freedom to use my own judgment	1	2	3	4	5
66. My work would provide for steady employment	1	2	3	4	5
67. There would be the chance to help people	1	2	3	4	5
68. There would be more routine aspects in my work	1	2	3	4	5
69. My principal would handle fairly the complaints brought by teachers	1	2	3	4	5
70. My principal would provide help on hard problems	1	2	3	4	5

In my ideal teaching position, how important is it that . . .

	not important	only slightly important	important	very important	extremely important
71. There would be the chance to do something different every day	1	2	3	4	5
72. There would be many opportunities to work with other teachers	1	2	3	4	5
73. I would be able to find challenge in my work	1	2	3	4	5
74. I would enjoy talking about teaching, the longer I had been doing it	1	2	3	4	5
75. I would like all aspects of my job	1	2	3	4	5
76. I would have the chance to make use of my abilities and skills	1	2	3	4	5
77. The teachers would work toward higher educational goals for children	1	2	3	4	5
78. I would have chances for advancement	1	2	3	4	5
79. My work would lead to rapid progress in my career	1	2	3	4	5
80. There would be a chance to finish what I start	1	2	3	4	5
81. My pay would reflect the type of work I do	1	2	3	4	5
82. There would be a spirit of cooperation among all of the people in school	1	2	3	4	5
83. My co-workers would get along well with each other	1	2	3	4	5
84. My co-workers would be efficient teachers	1	2	3	4	5
85. There would be time to try my own methods of teaching	1	2	3	4	5
86. There would be the chance to work under little supervision	1	2	3	4	5
87. I would remain an individual even if I do the same work others are doing	1	2	3	4	5
88. There would be the freedom to do my work as I think best	1	2	3	4	5
89. I would get praise for doing a good job	1	2	3	4	5
90. There would be much responsibility in my work	1	2	3	4	5
91. My employment would be steady	1	2	3	4	5
92. I would have the chance to do things for people	1	2	3	4	5
93. My responsibilities would be clearly and completely presented	1	2	3	4	5
94. There would be a personal relationship between my principal and the faculty	1	2	3	4	5
95. My principal would guide his faculty	1	2	3	4	5
96. There would be the chance to do many different things in my work	1	2	3	4	5
97. I would have few extra responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
98. I would be able to do work that would challenge my skills	1	2	3	4	5
99. I would enjoy taking work home, the longer I held the position	1	2	3	4	5
100. I would like my job, all things considered	1	2	3	4	5

1. What do you like about teaching as a career?

2. What changes or suggestions would you recommend to make teaching a better career choice?

3. Who influenced you? How did you get into teaching?

4. Is teaching as a career increasing or decreasing in its attraction of capable graduates? Why?

5. What other career fields appeal to you?

THANK YOU!